

BEFORE THE
POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF
AUDREY HUGUENIN, et. al. and
CITY OF COLVILLE,

Appellants & Intervenors,

and

WEIR H. BELL,

Appellant & Respondent,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,

Respondent.

PCHB Nos. 79-77, 79-78,
79-89, 79-99, 79-100,
79-101, 79-102, and 80-42

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
AND ORDER

This matter, the appeal of Department of Ecology regulatory orders relating to water rights claimed by Weir H. Bell, came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Nat W. Washington, Chairman, and David Akana, Member, convened at Colville, Washington, on August 25, and 26, 1980. Hearing examiner William A. Harrison presided. Respondent elected a formal hearing pursuant to

1 RCW 43.21B.230 in each of the above consolidated matters.

2 Appellants and intervenors Huguenin et. al., were represented by
3 their attorney, David E. McGrane. Intervenor City of Colville was
4 represented by its attorney, Andrew C. Braff. Appellant and
5 respondent Bell was represented by his attorney, William J. Powell.
6 Respondent Department of Ecology was represented by Wick Dufford,
7 Assistant Attorney General. Reporter Lorraine Warner recorded the
8 proceedings.

9 Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined. From
10 testimony heard, exhibits examined, and having viewed the site and
11 being fully advised, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

12 FINDINGS OF FACT

13 I

14 This is a dispute concerning the right to divert the waters of
15 Prouty Creek in Stevens County for the purpose of irrigation.

16 By grant dated April 11, 1892, the United States of America
17 conveyed to George F. Prouty, a homesteader, government lots 1, 2, and
18 3 of Sec. 7, T.35N, R.40 E.W.M. and the SE 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Sec.
19 12, T.35N, R.39 E.W.M. This totaled approximately 160 acres. The
20 property then changed hands three times ending with its acquisition by
21 F. Joseph Greif on May 14, 1907. A year and a half later in 1908,
22 Greif sold the Sec. 12 parcel (40 acres) to Heberling together with
23 access across Greif's retained land to Prouty Creek for a 2-inch
24 pipeline. This pipeline was intended solely for domestic and not
25 irrigation diversion.

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

Following these events, Greif sought to establish the irrigation water right which is under dispute in this case. Acting under the law then prevailing (Chapter CXLII, Laws of 1891), Greif posted a written notice near the southeast corner of lot 1 on May 31, 1909. The notice proclaimed Greif's intent to divert water from Prouty Creek at the rate of 5 cubic feet per second for irrigation and domestic purposes on lots 1, 2, and 3 (some 120 acres). The notice further stated that diversion would be by means of "ditch and flume" commencing near the southeast corner of lot 1 and running generally south for one-fourth mile. The notice finally stated Greif's intention that the works for this diversion would be completed within five years. The notice was duly recorded with the Stevens County Auditor on June 9, 1909, where it remains on file.

II

Greif sold lots 1, 2, and 3, about one year after posting the written notice, to Emanuel Sheppardson on April 26, 1910. During 1910, whether constructed by Greif or Sheppardson, there was a small dam which diverted water from Prouty Creek at the place stated in the notice. The water ran into ditches some two feet wide which ran southerly about one-fourth mile to the area of the then existing house. There, by several narrower ditches, Sheppardson applied the waters of Prouty Creek to a garden and orchard of approximately one-half acre each, total one acre. The garden produced corn, the orchard produced cherries, and these were sold to neighbors if not kept for home use. This irrigated acre was in contrast to the

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

1 unirrigated, remaining acreage of the property which then and now
2 produces the crop which provides the primary income from the land.
3 The one-half acre cherry orchard was pulled out by 1915.

4 In 1924, Sheppardson's widow, Rhoda A. Sheppardson, conveyed an
5 easement to the Federal Land Bank allowing the same diameter pipe, at
6 the same depth, from the same point of diversion as the domestic water
7 pipeline allowed when Greif disposed of the Section 12 property in
8 1908 (see Finding of Fact I, above). We find this to be a latter day
9 reinforcement of the 1908 domestic pipeline easement and unrelated to
10 the 1909 irrigation water right at issue.

11 III

12 Rhoda A. Sheppardson sold lots 1 and 2 to Axel Berg on July 1,
13 1925. At this date the dam and ditches which irrigated the one acre
14 garden-orchard in 1910 were gone. No irrigation was carried out from
15 Prouty Creek by or through Axel Berg during his 21 year ownership.
16 Berg once made a casual attempt to irrigate which began and ended, in
17 failure, all within one day.

18 IV

19 Berg sold lots 1 and 2 to Lawrence S. Dailey on September 20,
20 1946. No irrigation was carried out from Prouty Creek by or through
21 Lawrence S. Dailey during his 9 year ownership. In 1950, Dailey
22 signed a letter protesting a proposed irrigation diversion from Prouty
23 Creek by one Charles Windell in which Dailey asserted prior use of
24 Prouty Creek for stockwater. No assertion was made by Dailey claiming
25 any irrigation right. (Exhibit R-6.)

V

Dailey sold lots 1 and 2 to John W. Sleeth on August 3, 1954, who failed to apply waters of Prouty Creek to irrigation and sold to Melinda Hemnes on February 16, 1957. Two year later, on March 18, 1959, Melinda Hemnes applied to the State of Washington for a permit to divert waters of Prouty Creek for irrigation and stock water on lots 1 and 2. The application form posed the question, "are there any existing water rights appurtenant to the above described property?" (referring to lots 1 and 2). Hemnes answered "no." Hemnes was granted a permit, No. 11625 but failed to apply waters of Prouty Creek to irrigation. This is so although Hemnes constructed a holding pond into which waters of Prouty Creek were diverted but not thereafter applied to irrigation.

VI

Hemnes sold lots 1 and 2 to Ed Chester on July 9, 1962, together with surface water permit 11625. No irrigation was carried out from Prouty Creek by or through Ed Chester or, following divorce, Dorothy Chester Olmstead during their 6 year ownership. Surface water permit 11625 was cancelled by order of the State on April 11, 1969.

VII

Dorothy Chester Olmstead sold lots 1 and 2 to James H. Becker on May 15, 1968. Becker sold lot 1 to Kenneth Huguenin in 1969 or 1970. Huguenin sold lot 1 to its present owner, William Schumaker in 1974 or 1975. No irrigation was carried out from Prouty Creek by or through Becker or Huguenin during their ownership.

VIII

Becker sold lot 2 to Weir H. Bell, appellant herein, on August 1, 1973. On August 8, 1973, Bell filed a Water Right Claim with the State asserting a right to divert the waters of Prouty Creek at five cubic feet per second for irrigation of 25 acres on lot 2, based upon the 1909 claim of Greif.

Appellant/Respondent Bell contends that certain indistinct depressions in the field between Prouty Creek and the county road are indications of old irrigation ditches. The evidence that these depressions were the remains of old irrigation ditches is not persuasive.

In 1977, Bell filed an "Application for Change of Water Right" with the Department of Ecology (DOE) seeking to move the point of diversion from lot 1 to lot 2. This was granted by DOE order in 1979, which order was appealed to this Board by seven of Bell's neighbors. While those appeals were pending DOE issued a regulatory order, in 1980, prohibiting Bell from diverting water from Prouty Creek under authority of the 1909 Greif claim. Bell has appealed this regulatory order to the Board. These matters were consolidated for hearing.¹

1. DOE issued and Bell appealed to this Board one further regulatory order which was consolidated herein also. This order, 80-163, required Bell to cease certain groundwater withdrawals from a well until approval of a change of location. The parties have stipulated that this order may be reversed.

IX

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

I

The issues posed for determination are those in the Second Pre-Hearing Order entered August 18, 1980. We will first consider whether Bell has a water right, for regulatory purposes, which is further divided into the question of 1) whether his claimed right came into being and, if so, the question of 2) whether it was later abandoned.

1) Whether the claimed right came into being? Bell claims a water right based upon succession to the 1909 claim of Greif. We conclude that the law applicable to Greif's 1909 claim was Chapter CXLII, Laws of 1891. Under that statute the right to use the water of any stream could be acquired by appropriation according to the following mandatory procedure:

1. Written notice was to be posted at the intended point of diversion stating a) intended withdrawal in cubic feet per second, b) the purpose for which the water is appropriated, c) the place of intended use and d) the means of diversion.

2. A copy of the written notice was to be filed for record with the auditor of the county where posted within ten days of posting.

3. Construction of the works for diversion was to be commenced within six months after posting.

We conclude that Greif complied with each of the above procedures.

The 1891 statute then goes on, however, to provide that:

1 1. the "works must be diligently and continuously
2 prosecuted to completion" and

3 2. "By strict compliance to the above rules the
4 appropriator's rights to the use of the water
actually stored or diverted relates back to the time
the notice was posted . . ." (emphasis added.)

5 We conclude that only the efforts of Greif and his successor
6 Sheppardson could be construed as diligent and continuous effort to
7 complete the diversion works. We further conclude that,
8 notwithstanding the representations of the posted and recorded notice,
9 the water actually diverted by Greif or Sheppardson never exceeded
10 that necessary for irrigation of one acre. The water right of Greif
11 therefore came into being to the extent necessary to irrigate only one
12 acre, and not 25 acres as claimed by Bell.

13 2. Whether the water right was abandoned? The Greif right was
14 acquired by appropriation, and may be lost, under the common law,
15 because of abandonment. Miller v. Wheeler 54 Wash. 429 (1909). This
16 is in accord with the law of other western states. See 2 W.A.
17 HUTCHINS, WATER RIGHTS LAWS IN THE NINETEEN WESTERN STATES 256-84
18 (1974). The Miller case, above, set forth the two elements of common
19 law abandonment in this state:

- 20 1. an actual relinquishment and
21 2. the intent to abandon,
22 which must concur. Miller, supra, P. 435.

23 Regarding actual relinquishment, we conclude that no waters of
24 Prouty Creek were diverted and applied to irrigation by Greif's
25 successors from, at the latest, 1925 to Bell's acquisition in 1973.
26 This non-user of 48 years constitutes an actual relinquishment of the
27

1 Greif water right.

2 Regarding the intent to abandon, the protracted non-user in this
3 case is evidence from which we infer an intent to abandon. This type
4 of inference was described with approval by the Supreme Court of
5 Colorado in Knapp v. Colorado River Water Conservation District, 131
6 Colo. 42, (1955) wherein it is stated:

7 Decisions of courts of last resort are legion in
8 support of the firmly recognized principle that where
9 a water right is not used for an unreasonable period
 of time, intent to abandon it may be implied. (279
 P.2d 426).

10 In this case, the intent to abandon shown by non-user alone is
11 corroborated by two other overt acts. The first of these is the 1950
12 letter signed by Lawrence S. Dailey, a successor of Greif,
13 affirmatively citing stockwater rights but making no mention of any
14 irrigation right. The second is the 1959 water right application of
15 Melinda Hemnes, a successor of Greif, expressly disclaiming any
16 existing water rights appurtenant to the "Greif" property which she
17 sought to irrigate via that 1959 application.

18 The evidence is clear and definite that the water right of Greif,
19 to irrigate one acre, was abandoned and lost before Bell acquired the
20 "Greif" property in 1973. The DOE order allowing change of the point
21 of diversion of this right should therefore be reversed, and the DOE
22 order prohibiting diversion under claim of this right should be
23 affirmed.

24 II

25 Because of our Conclusion of Law I relating to

1 | abandonment, we need not consider the issues of impairment of other
2 | water rights since the same are moot.

3 | III

4 | We have examined the other contentions raised by the parties and
5 | find them to be without merit.

6 | IV

7 | Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is
8 | hereby adopted as such.

9 | From these Conclusions the Board enters this

10 | ORDER

11 | The Department of Ecology Order for Change Under Registered Claim
12 | No. 32954 dated May 9, 1979, is hereby reversed. The Department of
13 | Ecology Order No. 80-164 prohibiting diversion from Prouty Creek under
14 | Claim No. 32954 is hereby affirmed.

15 | Pursuant to the parties' request, our review of Department of
16 | Ecology Order No. 80-163 relating to withdrawal of water from a well
17 | is to be disposed of by an agreed order to be presented by the parties.

18 | DONE at Lacey, Washington, this 16th day of December, 1980.

19 | POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

20 |
21 | Ray W. Washington
22 | RAY W. WASHINGTON, Chairman

23 |
24 | David Akana
25 | DAVID AKANA, Member

BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF)

AUDREY HUGUENIN, et al., and)
CITY OF COLVILLE,)

Appellants and Intervenor,)

and)

WEIR H. BELL,)

Appellant and Respondent,)

v.)

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,)

Respondent.)

PCHB Nos. 79-77, 79-78,
79-89, 79-99, 79-100,
79-101, 79-102 & 80-42ORDER DISMISSING REVIEW
OF DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
ORDER NO. 80-163

ORDER

Department of Ecology Order No. 80-163 having been superseded by the approval of a change in point of withdrawal under Ground Water Permit No. G3-25592P, and the Department of Ecology having formally cancelled said Order, the Board concludes that the request to review said Order is moot.

KENNETH O. EIKENBERRY ATTORNEY GENERAL
Wick Dufford
Assistant Attorney General

Temple of Justice
Olympia Wa 459-6159
98504 Telephone

1 Accordingly, review of Department of Ecology Order No. 80-163
2 is hereby dismissed.

3 DONE this 28th day of August, 1984.

4 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

5
6 Gayle Bothrock
7 GAYLE BOTHROCK, Chairman

8 Lawrence J. Faulk 8/20/84
9 LAWRENCE J. FAULK, Vice-Chairman

10
11
12
13 Presented by:

14
15 Wick Dufford
16 WICK DUFFORD
17 Assistant Attorney General
18 Attorney for
19 Department of Ecology
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ORDER OF
DISMISSAL